

05/02/2012

Attendees: Hope, Tasha, Jeff Cook, Riley Peterson, Dave DePeau, Lance Treadaeu, Mike Stearney, Bryan, Megan Leonard, Stephany Haack, Paul Grover, Adrian Canilho Burke

Call to Order- 4:01pm

Statement by Justice Grover- Discuss and vote on infractions of yes and no positions during UC referendum 2012. Court will ask questions of public attendees, where the public is spectatorial.
4:01pm

Review of the Infractions- 4:02-4:13pm

“Yes” Position Infractions...

- ⑩ Chalking within 15ft of a building entrance
- ⑩ Chalking did not have “Authorized...” statement.
- ⑩ Fliers on car windshields was against campus policy.
- ⑩ Fliers distributed randomly on tables in the Phoenix Club was expressly against Student Union policy.
- ⑩ Email sent to academic department chairs without “Authorized...” statement.
- ⑩ Email sent to academic department chairs encouraging faculty endorsement, which exerts an undue influence over student matters.

Chalking 15ft infraction- did not seem to have a extreme effect on election. University Policy is clear and available.

Authorized statement- There was blanket statement made for UC campaign materials. Legitimates chalking.

Windshields fliers- Public Safety made contact with UC about the fliers. Once Contact was made the UC stopped

Leaving fliers in phoenix club- Covered under Union Policy

Email to academic chairs- Was effectively labeled UC

Review of the Infractions- 4:13-4:25pm

“No” Position Infractions...

- ⑩ Poster on SGA office window did not have “Authorized...” statement.
- ⑩ Poster on SGA office window was illegally place under election bylaws 2012.
- ⑩ Poster ... did not comply with Union policy for banner size.
- ⑩ Email sent by current VP Dave DePeau to garner No votes.
- ⑩ Email did not have “Authorized...” statement.
- ⑩ VP DePeau used his position as undue influence on students.

In accordance with the principle of respect for the referendum process members of Student Government are allowed to campaign on their own behalf. However, they are in no way allowed to bring the power of their position in SGA to influence the opinions of the other students.

By their acceptance of a blatant violation of election rules, the members of the SGA that had seen the poster had a responsibility to address the infraction.

Motion to uphold the validity of yes position – Paul

Motion- Adrian

Second- Stephany

Vote 3-0 The motion passes 4:28pm

Motion to uphold the validity of no position- Paul

Motion- Adrian

Second- Stephany

Vote 3-0 The motion passes 4:31pm

Final statements 4:31-4:34pm

Paul- In the future expectations of conduct will be clearly laid out. The expectation of SGA neutrality in referendum matters will be expressively described in the Election Rules.

Stephany- The Court had valid recourse to decide either direction on either position. Once the relevant policies are clearly laid out in the future, the issue of not knowing a policy will not excuse noncompliance to the policies.

Adrian- No Comment.

Motion to adjourn- Paul

Motion- Adrian

Second- Stephany

Vote 3-0 Motion passes 4:35pm